



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,734	04/17/2001	Takaaki Nagai	NECF 18.591	9062

26304 7590 08/14/2002

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

OWENS, DOUGLAS W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,734

Applicant(s)

NAGAI, TAKAAKI

Examiner

Douglas W Owens

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of group I, claims 1-8 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. Figures 4 and 5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the semiconductor layer connecting the source and source line, as required in claims 3 and 4 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
in line 5 of page 20, "control" should be replaced with "contact"; and
in line 15 of page 20, "is" should be replaced with "are".
Appropriate correction is required.

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation, "...unit cells arranged in a matrix shape..." in lines 3 and 4. The scope of the claim is vague since a matrix can have a plurality of different shapes. It is not known what shape is being claimed.

Claims 5 and 6 recite the limitation "...transistors in a second direction in said...". The scope of the claim is vague because there is no first direction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 5,604,367 to Yang in view of US patent No. 6,091,634 to Wong.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Yang teaches a memory cell comprising:

a memory cell field effect transistor (T2) having a floating gate composed of a first semiconductor layer (24) in a first portion and a second semiconductor layer (42);

a select field effect transistor (T1) with a gate (24') composed of the first semiconductor layer (24) and having a drain (31) connected to a source (31) of said memory cell field effect transistor, said second portion of the floating gate and control gate extending to a position above the gate of said select field effect transistor;

a first insulation layer (28') which insulates the first semiconductor layer from the second semiconductor layer in the select field effect transistor;

a second insulation layer (64, 66, 68) on the second semiconductor layer; and

a third semiconductor layer (70) on the second insulation layer forming the control gate.

Yang does not teach an array of storage cells. Wong teaches an array of storage cells (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the array of memory cells taught by Wong into the device taught by Yang since it is necessary to form an array in order to make a memory device.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Yang does not teach a source line commonly connecting sources of the select transistors in a first direction and a semiconductor layer connecting said source and source line for each select transistor. Wong teaches a source line (56) commonly connecting select field effect transistors arranged in a first direction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Wong into the device taught by Yang for reasons discussed above. Neither Yang nor Wong explicitly teach a semiconductor device, wherein a semiconductor layer

Art Unit: 2811

connects the source and source line. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select use a semiconductor layer since it is a known material that is well suited for the intended use.

Regarding claims 5-8, Yang does not teach a drain diffusion layer shared between adjacent memory cell field effect transistors in a second direction in said unit cells. Wong teaches a drain diffusion layer shared between adjacent memory cell field effect transistors in a second direction in said unit cells. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Wong into the device taught by Yang for reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas W Owens whose telephone number is 703-308-6167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 703-308-2772. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/837,734

Page 6

Art Unit: 2811

DWO

August 11, 2002

Steven Loke
Director

Steven Loke